

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612 Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833 www.adstandards.com.au

CASE REPORT

1.	Complaint reference number	170/00
2.	Advertiser	Koala Glass
3.	Product	Professional Services
4.	Type of advertisement	TV
5.	Nature of complaint	Violence Other – section 2.2
	-	Health and safety – section 2.6
6.	Date of determination	Tuesday, 13 June 2000
7.	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

There are two television advertisements:

1. The advertisement first shows a car windscreen being broken by a bat, then a giggling toy koala as the assailant. A voiceover says: 'For a limited time only, Koala Glass is offering windscreen replacements from as low as \$139. Another smashing offer from Koala Glass.' The advertisement concludes with text: 'Koala Glass - Windscreen replacement from \$139 – Limited time offer – All Australian and proud of it – Proudly supporting the Hunter's koalas', followed by a shot of the koala on the car's bonnet attacking the windscreen with the bat.

2. The advertisement portrays a toy koala panting with the weight of a brick it is holding and saying, 'The people at Koala Glass asked me to help them sell more window glass.' The koala throws the brick, there is a sound of shattering glass and the koala says, 'There, that'll help.' The advertisement concludes with text: 'Koala Glass. In your Yellow Pages. Proudly supporting the Hunter's koalas.'

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant made regarding these advertisements included the following:

'I have seen these ads from early evening (young children's viewing time) to late night and find it disturbing that:

1) they depict the crime of gratuitous vandalism

2) use a koala in the vandalism crime'

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether these advertisements breached Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board was of the view that the actions portrayed by the toy koalas within the advertisements had the nature of a parody and did not contravene prevailing community standards in their depiction of violence; neither did the advertisements constitute a breach of prevailing community standards on safety issues. The Board determined that the advertisements did not breach the Code on these or any other grounds and, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.